

**BVCP Process Subcommittee Meeting #6**  
**November 18, 2015 Noon-1:30**  
**Park Central Room 401 Conference Room**



**Attendees:** Lieschen Gargano, John Gerstle, Sam Weaver, Elise Jones

**Staff:** Susan Richstone, Lesli Ellis, Jean Gatz, Courtland Hyser, Michael Davidson, Steven Giang

**Public:** (~6 members)

**\*Comments by subcommittee** are the bullet points that begin with bold text.

**\*\*Staff responses are in italics.**

**Agenda**

1. Report back on actions recommended at last meeting. (15 minutes)

- Revised Input graphic – handed out revised version. No comments
- Survey and focus groups

*Final response rate is 16% - 934 returned surveys; with similar response rates for both paper and online versions; Extension of the deadline and sending the post cards increased responses (260 additional).*

*Six focus groups were held to ask questions about the responses; groups mixed in demographics and where they live.*

- Process schedule

Process scheduled is being revised to adjust for “tracks” and when actions will be brought to boards.

**Many CC members haven’t been through the screening process before and will need info on criteria, implications if something doesn’t get through the screen, how they apply criteria and relationship to BVCP policies, subsequent steps in process. Info that has been provided to applicants and public would be good to get to the decision-makers as early as possible. There is elevated focus on this and getting info out early would be beneficial for everyone. Provide the info at the listening sessions. Let people know where they can get questions answered. Setting expectations for what it means to make it through the screen is important.**

**It is a bit different to have so many requests in areas I and II. There will be important criteria and threshold questions about resources and if it makes sense to analyze many small parcels or focus more on the larger policy questions or area by area planning. Perhaps focus on the places that are of most concern / focus. Feedback from the 4 boards about where we are spending our time is important.**

- Tour: *requested from the PB members. It was challenging to find dates that worked for most and make a useful tour. Staff will provide a virtual tour with information and photos.*
- Public Hearings – *Joint CC and PB Dec. 15. – PB will deliberate Dec. 17 about initial screening requests. CC – will deliberate Jan. 5*

*Joint BOCC and PC – Jan. 26; BOCC – Feb. 2. Each of the 4 bodies makes its own individual direction. Process – if any deny, or direct that the proposal does not advance, the proposal is*

*“out”. History has been that the boards are generally aligned. There will be more focus on sites with a county impact (area II) – it would be highly unusual for county boards to have a different view of parcels in the city. There is flexibility because this is only about what to analyze further – not approval of anything.*

## 2. Local Listening Sessions (35 minutes)

- Debrief from Central Area meeting on Nov. 9
  - Bigger room with better seating. Scoping extra space in advance
  - Signs for various departments present and better staff introductions earlier in the evening
  - Name tags for participants
  - Slight reframing of small group discussions (shorter first session, longer second session – defining facilitator and note taker beforehand)
- Planning ahead for next meetings
  - Wednesday, Nov. 18 - North Boulder / Palo Park
  - Monday, Nov. 30 – South Boulder
  - Wednesday, Dec. 2 – Southeast Boulder
  - Monday, Dec. 7 – Gunbarrel
  - Wednesday, Dec. 9 – Crossroads / East Boulder

**Good staffing from many depts. – fire, police, transportation. Guessing – 90-100. Sam Weaver, Macon Cowles, and Mary Young attended. Thought the conversations were high-level and high quality. People were listening to each other. People picked topics and they could switch to a topic they wanted to talk about. We are encouraged by the range of opinions and people coming from different perspectives and demographics. People listened to each other, inter-relationship of issues and desire of people to find common ground.**

**For the upcoming Gunbarrel meeting, it would be good to have county staff present. It would be useful to have good info on BCHA or BHP – Elise will check about staffing. Commissioners haven’t discussed representation. BCHA and transportation staff planning to be there to answer questions. Parks and OS might be good to include. Staff should be prepared to ensure broader conversation before it goes narrow. Ensure energy / muni staff available if people want to talk about that.**

*North boulder / Palo Park – will be concern about the housing development – BHP site in Palo Park that goes to PB 11/19 for annexation and concept plan. Staff should be prepared for people coming to want to discuss.*

*South and SE - Flood mitigation and CU site. Will have PW staff at these. CU south analysis – we could touch on briefly and ensure we provide info. Staff has been working with CU on site analysis and overall process on overall land use designation change.*

## 3. Public Comment (10 min)

Donna George – went to the Central Boulder listening session, thought it was good, info, displays, printout of requests. She asked to put that online and it happened. Good to tell the public what would happen if some of these text and policy changes go through. Good to educate public at the sessions.

Received a letter about the screening process – this should say that if it doesn't get through this process it is dead. It would be good if the letter goes out to area residents. People wouldn't know about the process otherwise. The public hearing – time for requesters and general public. Would be good to have longer than 3 minutes for people to speak on more than one request. It seems like a lot for decision-makers to take in. Why would the housing authority or developers coming to listening sessions for the residents to give their input?

Dick Harris – Process graphic is difficult. People can't print them at home. Don't have it in color. Redesign so that you could print the cover sheet and area of interest at a certain time. Even the ones printed large are hard to see. If you do a tour – have clear, accurate maps. On the 4 body review – there should be some mechanism for groups to communicate with others about which to move forward. Idea about 'early wins' didn't work well in the past. He is on BHP Board. They considered the Palo Park site. Describes this as a peculiar situation but board didn't vote against it. Glad we are doing these sessions.

Michael Caplan – Regarding issues that were part of 300 and 301 – it is not clear how those issues will be dealt with in this process. Are they to be addressed? If so, how? Normal or finer design? Think these do need more work. *301 issues are already in process – affordable housing linkage fee process, development fee study.* **Council conversation to have at the retreat. Will discuss subcommunity planning – way of doing more granular planning. Some element in the land use planning. Typically weekend of Jan. 22. If sending observations – email cc., retreat planning committee (Lisa Morzel and Bob Yates). On the study session before retreat – likely have a discussion of the planning work plan.** *Chris Meschuk is the contact for the Development Fee Study.*

**Questions – Will CC receive a revised Community Profile and jobs back-casting? This will be important for us to have a good conversation about growth.** *Staff is adjusting employment numbers back from 2015 to 2001. Analysis is almost completed. Staff will update the community profile and trends with new info. If units are not built in the year they are allocated – there is a big # that could move ahead all at once.*

**Central Boulder is a big subcommunity – 1/3 of the population of boulder. Might discuss how to address that as part of comp plan or discuss in another process.**

Next meeting: Scheduled for December 16 but proposed to wait to meet until January after the initial hearings to schedule the next Process Subcommittee meeting.

Group agreed to cancel December meeting.